

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-26 are pending in the application. The applicant has amended claims 1, 12, 23, and 25. Claims 3-11 and 14-22, 24, and 26 remain in the application without amendment.

Claims 1-3, 10, 12, 14, 21, 23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Bodas (US Appl. Pub. No. 2004/0003194. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment of independent claims 1, 12, 23, and 25 overcomes this rejection.

Independent claim 1 as amended now recites, among other things, the following limitations:

“the integrated circuit being further configured to program a different external clock delay for each of the transmissions, to communicate each of the transmissions between the integrated circuit and the electronic component in response to the corresponding different external clock delays, to record timing parameters associated with each of the transmissions communicated between the integrated circuit and the electronic component in response to the communication of each of the transmissions, and to calibrate the external clock delay as a function of the recorded timing parameters for each of the transmissions to support future communications between the integrated circuit and the electronic component”.

Applicant submits that the cited reference does not teach the combination defined by the claim, particularly the quoted limitation.

Support for the present amendment may be found in the present specification, for example, in the calibration algorithm of FIG. 5. The claimed “program a different external clock delay for each of the transmissions” limitation is represented, for example, by blocks 508, 514, and 516. The claimed “communicate each of the transmissions ...” limitation is represented, for example, by block 510. The “record timing parameters associated with each of the transmissions ...” limitation is represented, for example, by block 512. The “calibrate the external clock delay ...” limitation is represented, for example, by block 522.

The examiner appears to have misinterpreted some portions of Bodas. For example, at par. 0016, lines 24-29, Bodas teaches shifting the clock signal to compensate for lengths of traces used to route the clock 110 and the command bus 120. This is not the same as the claimed “calibrate the external clock delay as a function of the communications.” More particularly, Bodas “trace length” is not the same as the claimed “communications.”

At par. 0019, Bodas teaches two embodiments of delay logic 200 and 250 for shifting a clock signal for communications, but not “as a function of communications,” as claimed.

In FIG. 2a, the multiplexer 219 chooses which clock delay 214-217 to pass based on a selection signal from the register 213 to produce the “clock out.” However, Bodas does not teach or suggest how the register 213 knows which clock delay to choose.

The applicant acknowledges that some of what the applicant considers a misinterpretation of Bodas by the examiner may be the examiner’s interpretation of Bodas in light of the claim language presented in the previous Office Action. Therefore, the applicant has amended the present independent claims to be more definite and to further distinguish the present independent claims over Bodas.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 1, and independent claims 12, 23, and 25 which have similar limitations to claim 1, under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn in the next Office action.

Furthermore, the 102(e) rejection of dependent claims 3, 10, 14, and 21 should be withdrawn in the next Office action at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1 and 12 as amended.

The remaining dependent claims 4, 5, 6, 11, 15-17, 22, 24, and 26 have been rejected under 35USC103(a) having Bodas as the primary reference. For the reason that the independent claims are allowable, claims 4, 5, 6, 11, 15-17, 22, 24, and 26 should be allowed in the next Office action.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of the response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 17-0026. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 25, 2007

By: /Donald C. Kordich/
Donald C. Kordich
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,213

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
(858) 658-5928 Ph.
(858) 845-8455 Fax